

HF

2046

C726

UC-NRLF



B 3 110 371

YC 05565



Cobden club


THE  
'SCIENTIFIC' TARIFF

AN EXAMINATION AND EXPOSURE

*Reprinted from the "Westminster Gazette"*



CASELL & COMPANY, LIMITED  
London, New York, Toronto and Melbourne  
1909



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

HF2076

C726

# THE "SCIENTIFIC" TARIFF

## AN EXAMINATION AND EXPOSURE

*The work already done by the Tariff Commission has provided us with the necessary information on the subject of our widespread commerce, and has given us the materials for a really scientific Tariff.*—MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S New Year Message.

Government by the edicts of Lansdowne House is to have its corollary in the setting aside of Royal Commissions and all such antiquated procedures in favour of the decisions of a committee of gentlemen gathered in an office in Victoria-street. The United States, with a singular lack of appreciation of the possibilities of a situation, think it necessary to submit the revision of the tariff to a duly appointed Ways and Means Committee. Democrats may, as they profess, regard it as "cheek" on their part to ask for any protection for themselves from that body, but at least they know that the whole of the committee men are not of one mind. The aspect of an impartial tribunal is maintained with some care. There is no pretence about the English Tariff Commission. Its members are all of one fixed principle, pledged to a definite policy, sworn opponents of Free Trade, willing in a measure to listen to any Free Trader who will waste his time and his breath by giving evidence, but definitely determined from the first day of the investigation that the outcome of all inquiry shall be the recommendation of a tariff. Hitherto the deliberations of the Commission have received just the amount of attention that an investigation on these lines deserves, and that is very little. Now that it has been definitely announced that the work of this body is to be the basis of the legislation of any Conservative Administration of the future, it becomes necessary to examine rather more closely the volumes which contain the reports of the Commissioners.

In the present articles no more is attempted than a careful study of the evidence such as could be made by any intelligent reader. It will be shown that, far from being scientific, the tariff proposed, where duties have been suggested, is based on no more than the desire to offer a tempting bait to an industry, that where an import duty would affect the raw material of a more specialised industry there is avoidance of this circumstance in approaching the second industry, that a large proportion of the witnesses who ask for

import duties also complain that under present conditions the British workman has shorter hours and higher wages than his foreign competitors, that the duties actually proposed do not meet the demands made by the dominant witnesses even at this stage of the agitation, and that the interests of the consumer are regarded as of entirely secondary importance.

#### IGNORING THE EVIDENCE.

The first point that the reader discovers for himself is that the actual recommendations of the Commission have very little reference to the weight of evidence given before the members. Not only is the verdict settled before the evidence is given—the very terms of the sentence are decided. An ordinary investigating body is presumed to be swayed by the testimony which is placed before it; its report takes on something of the colour of the facts that are presented by witnesses. There is very little of any such method in the ways of the Tariff Commission. Mr. Chamberlain had spoken of a two-shilling duty on wheat. A two-shilling duty is accordingly recommended. Ten per cent. was to be, in Mr. Chamberlain's sketch of a tariff, the impost on manufactured goods. Ten per cent. it shall be, says the Commission. But when the investigator goes beyond the recommendations and begins to examine the evidence he finds that the people who are really asking for Protection have an entirely different scale in their minds. "Two shillings a quarter on wheat," say the Commissioners, but here is the admission made in their report (paragraph 375):

The average price of British wheat for 1906 has been 27s. 9d., and the evidence we have received is to the effect that no considerable extension of wheat-growing can take place unless the price is at least 40s. per quarter, and to restore the growth of wheat to anything like its old proportions a rise in price to 50s. per quarter would probably be required. This would mean duties as high as, and in most cases higher than, those which prevail in the most highly protected foreign countries.

#### THE DEMAND FOR MORE.

Certainly the Commissioners do not overstate the effect of the evidence. A few extracts will show what is really in the minds of the men who are not concerned to shape their demands to the exigencies of the political platform. There are pages of brief extracts from the evidence of men who want higher duties, but a few must suffice:

Form No. 12,113.

Nothing but a bounty of 10s. per quarter on home-grown wheat will be of any benefit to us.

W. A. Prout, Farmer.

I am distinctly in favour of a bounty of 5s. per quarter on English-grown wheat provided the farmer kept it in stock until April.

J. Eames, Farmer.

There should be a higher duty on foreign, say 5s. per quarter, and 2s. 6d. on Colonial wheat.

Form No. 12,213.

A 5s. duty should be put on all foreign corn other than from the Colonies, putting a duty on them of 2s. per quarter.

Form No. 12,447.

Two shillings per quarter upon foreign barley is not nearly sufficient. Foreign flour should pay 5s. per sack to benefit the British farmer.

Form No. 12,291, Farmer.

Put 10s. per quarter duty on corn and let the farmer have power to purchase his farm, and Government lend him money at 2½ per cent., repayable in thirty years.

J. Mills White, Farmer.

Ought to be increased to prevent the price ever going down to less than 10s. per sack, as a few years ago.

Space, and not the exhaustion of material, forbids further quotation at this point. Enough has been extracted to show how short a distance the actual proposals go to satisfy those who desire duties on wheat. So it is with manufacturers. The pottery manufacturers state by a huge majority that they want a twenty-five per cent. duty to make their business profitable. The Commissioners recommend ten per cent., for no apparent reason except that that amount fulfils the platform promise. Again, with cotton the following schedule is suggested :

Raw Cotton .....	Free.
Yarns and Twists of all Descriptions .....	Free.
Cotton Tissues—grey .....	Free.
Other Cotton Tissues and Manufactures ...	Duties in no case to exceed 10 per cent.

How far does this follow the suggestion put out by witnesses? One reply is typical of a good many. It runs :

Messrs. Rigg Brothers.

Tax them as they tax you.

That is to say, according to a table that is given elsewhere in the Report on Cotton, the duties should range from the 6 to 7 per cent. on yarns that Belgium imposes to the 375 per cent. that the United States puts on cotton threads. This is a far wandering from the duties of not more than 10 per cent. But where duties are suggested 10 per cent. becomes almost generally the minimum. The following are samples of evidence on this point :

Form No. 5,159.

Ten per cent. on dyed cotton yarns; 10 to 12½ per cent. on low and medium-coloured woven cotton cloth; 15 to 17½ per cent. on fine and medium-coloured woven cotton cloth.

Form No. 2,484.

Ten to 20 per cent. on polished and mercerised yarns.

Form No. 2,069.

Fifty per cent. on silk goods. The upper classes can well afford to pay this on real silk. Jap. and French silks come into the market much too cheaply for fine muslins.

The Enfield Embroidery Company.

Twenty-five per cent. on embroidered curtains and kindred articles. An advance in cost of imported goods would enable us to advance prices and yet compete.

F. Drake and Co.

Twenty-five per cent. on webbing.

Twenty per cent. on twine.

It would we suppose raise the price of webbing and twine somewhat.

There is no fine platform sentiment about these replies. They are most refreshing in their frankness. These are men who know what they want, and when the first step has been taken will see that they get it. And they don't waste any tears over the consumer. He "can well afford to pay." At last we get behind the sophists and the trimmers and see what is really at the back of the Protectionist movement.

### THE MISREPRESENTATION OF LANCASHIRE.

The value of the evidence given before the Tariff Commission is solely in the light it sheds upon the desires of those who seek Protection. Free Trade witnesses are naturally few. Here and there the reader may come across a refreshing thrust from somebody who has no belief in tariffs, but if the testimony given in regard to cotton, for example, were accepted as the voice of the trade, it would be assumed that Lancashire was far more unanimous in support of Protection than it has actually shown itself to be on behalf of Free Trade. The evidence has to be accepted, then, as one-sided, and to be dealt with as such. There is no reality in the pretence that all parties are being heard, simply because one great body of evidence is not tendered. Although what is reported is confessedly not all that was given, it sheds an ample light upon the real objects of Tariff Reformers, even though such condensations as the following, from the Report on Agriculture, may tempt the inquiring Free Trader to wish for more :

Fifty-three farmers in various parts of the United Kingdom state in so many words that the proposed duty would be of no benefit to them, and some of them oppose the change in the general interests of the community. (Par. 1,628.)

Forty-eight farmers state in so many words that the proposed duty would make very little difference to them. (Par. 1,614.)

Several farmers make the general statement that in their opinion the proposed duty would only benefit them if rates and taxes were reduced by the proceeds. (Par. 1,598.)

There is no reason to complain that the Tariff Commission, as a private body, should thus find it necessary to summarise the evidence before it. On the face of it the "boiling-down" seems to have been done with fairness, and what is presented certainly affords sufficient material to expose the pure selfishness of the demands that are made by the different industries.

One other observation must be made in regard to the authority of many of the witnesses. We take especially the Report on the Cotton Industry, which was published in 1905. At the moment when the various witnesses were giving their evidence the sky was already streaked with the rays that heralded the brightest day ever known in the cotton industry. The greatest boom in the history



of Lancashire was already in sight, but these Jeremiahs of Tariff Reform saw nothing of it. One by one they raise their voices in woe and lamentation. Mr. David Marriage says :

I am sorry to say the state of trade is very bad.

The fancy-cotton trade remains practically, to a great extent, in our hands ; but the plain trade is gradually being lost, and we fear we shall lose still further.

Mr. John P. Dixon.

The outlook for the spinners and manufacturers in this country is none too bright, handicapped as they are at present.

Even Mr. John Baynes, the prized witness on the cotton trade, whose evidence is given first, says : " I think we are on the eve of dumping, because our exports have been stationary, while foreign countries have a very large increase in their exports." And this was on the eve of the greatest expansion of British cotton exports that has taken place. Here be blind leaders, indeed !

#### AVOIDANCE OF THE ISSUE.

At some stage in the researches of the Tariff Commission a sense of the danger of drawing up the " scientific tariff " with too much precision seems to have seized the imagination of these zealous workers. Iron and steel are accorded their schedule of duties, the tariff for agriculture is all cut and dried, cotton receives its promise of 10 per cent., and then there comes a marvellous lack of confidence in this plain and straightforward method of dealing. Possibly there developed a sense that as knowledge of the rule of three still exists, people might work out for themselves the probable effect of the proposed tariffs upon trades whose interests are conflicting if too many figures were supplied, and with that would come a cooling of enthusiasm. Or it may be that the Commissioners themselves were struck by the pure futility of drawing up tables which had very little relation to the evidence before them, and decided to leave the world to find out from the witnesses what the various industries desire. Whatever the cause, in report after report the Commissioners begin to speak vaguely of " duties," or content themselves with summarising the evidence in favour of imposts.

If we turn to the report on pottery industries, this is what is discovered under the head of " Remedial Measures " :

The witnesses are unanimous in their views as to the necessity of the imposition of import duties in this country, and a large number of manufacturers put forward suggestions. . . . Manufacturers are practically agreed that duties of from 10 per cent. to 25 per cent. would meet the case.

It will be discussed later how far this paragraph really represents the weight of evidence, but its non-committal tone is in striking contrast to that precise schedule, ranging from nothing to 10 per cent., in which the Commissioners dealt with the iron trade. One reason may be that it is perfectly plain that the pottery manufacturers have no intention of being content with so small a duty as Mr. Chamberlain fixed as the limit of his tariff.

## A LACK OF CONFIDENCE.

In regard to wool the Commissioners are driven even further into retreat. Here there is no attempt at a report—only a long summary of evidence, which ends with no suggestion of remedies. Engineering betrays some want of confident recommendation. Here is the paragraph which is headed “Duties”:

The great majority of those giving evidence favour a moderate system of import duties, with preference for the British Colonies and India, not alone because of the direct benefits in the home and export trades, but also because of the greater security and the stimulus to improved methods of production which it is believed such a system would provide. Increased production would, it is thought, tend to lower costs and keep down prices.

Whatever may be the value of this kind of writing as an index to the opinion of the witnesses who have appeared before the Commission, it advances us very little, if at all, towards the framing of that “scientific tariff” which the Commissioners were to produce all ready for incorporation in the first Conservative Budget. These paragraphs are not even pious opinions; they are the mere summing-up of men who have no recommendations to offer.

Without any disposition to use strong language, it may be said that the bogus nature of the whole inquiry is brought out by the report on the engineering industries. It so happens that three at least of the previous Reports have a direct bearing upon engineering and its cognate businesses. In regard to iron and steel definite recommendations are made for duties upon the products that are the raw materials with which the engineers work. In the evidence upon the various branches of textiles there are several suggestions that a heavy export duty should be placed on English machinery. Both of these proposals have a vast bearing, so far as engineering is concerned, upon the framing of the tariff. Will it be believed that in the schedule of questions addressed to the different firms both topics are entirely avoided? Manufacturers are asked:

What minimum duties, if any, on the articles imported, similar to those you manufacture, do you suggest as sufficient to safeguard the interests of your trade?

Import duties—that is the pleasant bait held out to the manufacturers, but if the inquiry had been honest there would have been another question in this form:

What export duty on the goods you manufacture would, in your opinion, be sufficient to prevent them going abroad, there to make articles which come into competition with English products?

No such query was put, although the Commissioners had that actual proposal before them. Such a question would have shown the true inwardness of Tariff Reform a little too openly. In the official queries there is just as marked an avoidance of the taxation of raw materials. The Commissioners might have said, “We have recommended certain duties on the raw materials that you use. Are you or are you not in favour of these?” That would

have been an honest inquiry, but it was not put. So far as the official forms are concerned the engineers are left in blissful ignorance that anybody has even dreamed of a tax on their raw materials.

### OBJECTIONS FROM ENGINEERS.

Fortunately, whatever the forgetfulness of those who drew up the forms, the subject of raw materials seems to have troubled the minds of certain of the witnesses. There are one or two, and one or two only, who do not object to a tax on their materials. As for the remainder, it may be said that where partly manufactured goods from abroad are utilised in a business, there is a strong objection to taxation. Mr. A. Bornemann gives evidence upon railway engineering, and he says :

If you tax materials, &c., which we cannot produce here, instead of benefiting yourself, you are doing the reverse, because there is an infinity of imported articles which are not produced here, either because we have not got the raw material or because we are unable to make them.

Some other opinions on the same point are worthy of quotation :

Every country offers us their raw materials, which have to compete against the productions of other countries, and this puts us in the position, as I have said before, of being able to produce a better article at the same money, or the same article at less money.—(Mr. W. A. Smith.)

Do not tax parts; they are *quasi* raw material.—(Mr. M. O'Gorman.)

We must never think of putting a tax on raw material. . . . Pig-iron is raw material.—(Witness No. 270.)

It must be remembered that unless we can obtain the raw material, either foreign or surplus home production, at the necessary cheap rates, the work will not come to this country at all.—(Cyanide Plant Supply Co.)

As we purchase our felts for above manufacture in Germany, Free Trade is a necessity to us.—(Form No. 686.)

By the free import of steel, sheet iron, wire, girders, and bars, chemical apparatus, pure chemicals, leather, &c., we can buy in the cheapest market.—(Form No. C 4,670.)

With the present free hand in buying raw material we do not want any duty, but, of course, if an import duty caused a rise in raw material we should want a protective rate against such combines that had lower-priced raw material.—(J. Fraser and Son, Limited.)

We can buy our raw material in the best markets, and any increase of cost either in this or wages would finish our foreign trade.—(Messrs. Pollock, Whyte, and Waddell.)

In speaking of "raw material" in the engineering trade, it may be added, the reference is in nearly all cases to actually manufactured goods, such as iron and steel, plates, castings, and other articles in regard to which the Tariff Commission has already decided upon a duty of from 5 to 10 per cent.

### WHAT IS RAW MATERIAL?

Occasionally there is found in these pages a refreshing outburst which shows how much further the definition of raw material may be carried in regard to particular trades. Mr. W. A. Smith in giving evidence in respect to the making of motor-cars said :

We have from America probably the best automatic lathes in the world. We get them in free of duty; in France they have to pay about 40 per cent. on them. . . . We have in our works English, French, German, Belgian, Scotch, and American machinery, all the best that money can buy, and all brought in free, a position that no other manufacturing nation except ourselves can occupy. . . . We have between £50,000 and £60,000 worth of machinery, probably £30,000 of which is foreign. Our capital expenditure, if we had to pay a 10 per cent. import duty upon the cost, would have increased by £3,000.

Here actually finished machine tools are but the means to a higher end. Mr. Smith goes on to relate how cylinders, carburetters, lubricators, and springs are got free from France; "whilst in France the same maker will naturally charge his neighbour a higher price than he charges us, because he is protected to that extent. Whenever a car built of these articles goes outside France—granted always that the French and the British makers have to pay the same duty, as in Spain, for instance—we are naturally in a better position to get that trade."

In spite of the disturbing influence of an occasional Mr. Smith, the Tariff Commission goes on with its use of a different bait for each trade and its careful concealment from each of the effect of other proposals. The manufacturer of steel plates is promised 10 per cent. duty, but the point is not put to the boiler-maker how he regards this. Among farmers and millers there is a general fear of a tax on agriculture and milling machinery expressed in such sentences as this:

I fear a duty on foreign wheat would not do me any good, while under the tariff I should pay more for my implements.—(Form No. 5,978.)

If you tax the manufactured articles, farmers will have to pay more for their machines, &c., so they want something in return.—(Form No. 4,914.)

We should have to pay more for our implements.—(Mr. A. C. Marriage.)

The manufacturer of agricultural implements, however, has very little regard for the fears of the farmer. Duties of 10, 15, and 25 per cent. are suggested by different witnesses; while another says, "A heavy duty should be put on foreign implements, so as to keep our men employed." And the Tariff Commission holds out its hopes of a duty on machinery to the manufacturer, in convenient forgetfulness of the farmer, and remains silent about that suggestion of an export duty on textile machinery while it whispers to the engineers of "import duties to keep out competitors."

## A CLAMOUR FOR HIGH DUTIES.

*A moderate duty on all manufactured goods not exceeding 10 per cent. on the average.*—MR. CHAMBERLAIN, 1903.

*The chief manufacturers would have been infinitely better pleased had the impost been doubled or even quadrupled.*—THE DAILY TELEGRAPH, 1903. Article on Furniture.

Furniture is not one of the problems which the Tariff Commission has considered as yet, but the chief manufacturers in that industry certainly stand in no isolated position in their desire for "more." In the earlier pages some examples have been

given of the duties which manufacturers seek, and these have been contrasted with the very modest proposals of the Tariff Commissioners or with their more sensible avoidance of any proposals at all when the issues began to be a little complicated. The supply of these suggestions for big duties is beyond possible limits of quotation, but anybody who reads the evidence in detail will find the trades, whether prosperous or the reverse, competing against one another in the clamour for high imposts. It is perhaps to be expected that Mr. Chamberlain's 10 per cent. should be accepted, where duties are demanded, as a minimum rather than an average. Ten per cent. becomes the first step in the upward progress towards the final exclusion of the foreigner from the market. That is the definite ideal of such manufacturers as Firm No. 6,537, who fix the required duty at

as much as will effectually keep all such goods out of our market—say, 20 per cent. at least.

This particular firm's evidence is in the report on cotton—a trade which depends entirely for prosperity upon the vast exports that go alike to protected and unprotected countries. The same spirit breathes in the evidence of Mr. David Marriage, who says :

I should suggest 10 per cent. as a minimum, and with the highly protected countries you might have to raise it to any limit.

A similar idea is expressed in a somewhat different way by Mr. C. E. Midleton :

I suggest the following duties : On low and medium cotton goods, 10 to 12 per cent. ; fine goods, 15 to 20 per cent. ; but no hard and fast lines should be drawn.

There is more of the spirit of the "big revolver" in the demand of Messrs. J. B. Spray and Co., who say :

The same duty to be imposed on all foreign made-up goods as they impose on ours. Take one country at a time, and unless they allow our goods free access into their country put the same duty on their goods as they put on ours.

#### INTENTION TO RAISE PRICES.

These answers are typical of many others in the cotton report, and before passing on to show that exactly the same spirit is found among the manufacturers in other trades it may be observed that many of the witnesses are quite frank as to the effect of the duty in raising prices. Occasionally discretion veils the truth, or some euphemism is used, as that duties will enable "better margins" to be obtained or prices will be "better all round"—better, that is to say, for the manufacturer. Fortunately there are blunter men than those making these sugar-coated suggestions who do not seek to disguise the pleasant raid on the consumer's pocket that is in contemplation. A few brief quotations illustrate this :

Twenty-five per cent. on embroidered curtains and kindred articles.

An advance in cost of imported goods would enable us to advance prices and yet compete.—(The Enfield Embroidery Company.)

Would enable us to get better prices.—(Firm No. 4,740.)

A duty would benefit us and the cloth manufacturer, though all the same the boot manufacturer would naturally have to pay more, and therefore the public.—(Elastic Boot Web Manufacturers.)

Possibly it is fortunate that the boot manufacturers have not been heard on that proposition. The boot manufacturer, indeed, seems to be a special target of the creators of a tariff. When we come to wool we find Firm No. 5,124 writing :

Our suggestion is a 20 per cent. duty on braids and boot-laces.

#### LOWERING PRICES FOR GERMANY.

But wool brings us to an all-important admission of the purpose of Tariff Reform. It is to be found in the evidence of Mr. Joe Benn, who says :

According to the cloth, 10 or 15 per cent. would permit of many things being sold in Germany that are now effectually shut out.

Make the home consumer pay more, that is to say, and you can sell cheaper in Germany. There is a cynical frankness about the proposal that is in itself an evidence of how rapidly our Tariff Reformers are advancing in boldness.

If other wool manufacturers are not quite so outspoken, they have the same hankering after high duties. Mr. Mitchell suggests that these should be from 10 to 20 per cent., the higher amount on the better goods, "which would enable us to raise revenue from those best able to pay it." No hint seems to have come to Mr. Mitchell that even those who are able to pay more may object to "us" raising revenue from them, for the "us" in this case includes Mr. Mitchell, who said :

When you came to the higher class goods, where the English manufacturer sold his goods he would get a higher price for them; he would make more profit on his higher class goods, but where he made it he would make it from people who could well afford to pay more.

Again we encounter the phrase "people who could well afford to pay more" in order not to swell the revenue of the country but to give more profit to the manufacturers. There are others who think with Mr. Mitchell. A few extracts of evidence will show this :

Effect of duty. To improve the prices.—(The Conway Woollen Company.)

It should be observed that "improving the price" is a synonym for "raising the price." These things have to be considered from the manufacturer's point of view. So when Messrs. John Foster and Son say : "We consider the duty would have a very beneficial effect" on prices, they mean that the purchaser would have to pay more, not that he would get more for his money. Firm No. 4,530, who suggest duties of fifteen to twenty per cent. on woollen goods, add : "Prices might go to 3d. or 4d. per yard higher," which form of stating the situation needs no footnote. Neither do the proposals of Messrs. Porritt Brothers and Austin, which are :



Twenty-five per cent. on woollen felts for paper-makers; 25 per cent. on cotton felts for paper-makers; 15—20 per cent. on cotton ducks and filtering-cloths; 20—25 per cent. on other manufactures of wool and wool and linen; 20—25 per cent. on cotton and linen goods.

(Prices.) Probably an advance at first, almost to the extent of the duty.

### DEMANDS OF THE POTTERS.

This is as plain to the man who reads as is the reply which Messrs. A. Godwin, Limited, make in the report devoted to pottery :

We suggest a 20 per cent. duty on Dutch glazed tiles. The effect would be we could advance prices quite 20 per cent.

A truly pleasant effect for the manufacturer! With pottery we are at once in an atmosphere of high duties. Here we find very little mention of a beggarly 10 per cent. Typical replies to the forms sent out are :

We should suggest a duty of 25 per cent. on earthenware, domestic crockery, and 33 1-3 per cent. on china—domestic crockery and fancy.—(Pountney and Company, Limited.)

In common goods 10 per cent. would perhaps be enough, because the freight would be heavier. There is no section of the business that would require more than 25 per cent.—(Mr. T. B. Johnston.)

China, 25 per cent.—(Sampson Smith.)

We suggest a duty of 25 per cent. at least on all china tea and breakfast ware and art ware. Prices ought to go up 5 to 10 per cent.—(E. Brain and Company.)

Twenty-five per cent. on china ware of all descriptions.—(Herbert J. Colclough.)

Twenty-five per cent. ad valorem on all imported china.—(E. Hughes and Company.)

We suggest a 25 per cent. duty on common china and small ornamental ware.—(Form 6,574.)

All descriptions of china clay (not earthenware) 30 per cent.—(Edwards and Brown.)

We are anxious to secure our home trade, and that with our Colonies, and nothing less than 30—35 per cent. will keep the foreigner out.—(G. Warrilow and Sons.)

In some cases a duty of, say, from 10 to 20 per cent. would be sufficient, whilst in many other cases a 50 per cent. duty would scarcely be enough. Prices in most cases would be raised and would be firmer.—(G. L. Ashworth Brothers.)

### FEAR ABOUT RAW MATERIALS.

But pottery is disturbing to the Tariff Reformer in one branch of the industry. The brick-makers are a surly crew, who have clearly been soured in some way. Here are a few of their responses :

Your proposed policy can only do injury to the brick and building trades, however it may enrich the millers and machinery manufacturers.—(Walwyn T. Chapman.)

We do not want tariff charged upon rolled iron and wood, the only foreign goods we use.—(Grover and Sons.)

The imposition of any protective tax would increase the cost of our production without enabling us to obtain a better price for our goods, and would have a disastrous effect in our trade, both upon employer and employed.—(John Hall and Sons.)

We consider (under Protection) wages will go up, coal will advance in price, together with iron, steel, timber, and other articles used in our business, and that it will be quite impossible for us to get better prices for goods of our manufacture to compensate for the extra outlay.—(Form No. 4,374.)

Well, the Tariff Commissioners have burned their boats and exhausted their science in respect to these things. Iron has been promised a duty; wood is to have the special protection of Mr. Wyndham. The position looks a little gloomy for the makers of bricks and drain-pipes—and very like stalemate for the Tariff Commission. Messrs. John Alexander and Sons do suggest a way out so far as drain-pipes are concerned :

Agriculture is not paying, and we know of a great many cases where neither landlord nor tenant can afford to spend money on draining. The only remedy we can suggest is to give the farmers a bounty of 10s. or 15s. per quarter for the wheat they may have in the stack-yard in February.—(John Alexander and Sons.)

In 1906 the United Kingdom produced six and a half million quarters of wheat, and certainly very little of this would leave the stack-yard before February if there was a big bounty to be gained by holding it back. At 10s. a quarter there would be £3,250,000 for—drain-pipes! If that is to be the price to the nation for drain-pipes, what will be the total cost of a complete tariff? And where, with such a bounty as that, would be the Colonial Preference that is to stimulate the wheat production of the daughter-nations? It looks as though drain-pipes, with only a 2s. duty on wheat, can hope for nothing, any more than can bricks.

While the brick-makers are protesting against any duty at all on their iron, one turns to the report on engineering to find the witnesses not at all satisfied with the modest charges on iron and steel that the Tariff Commissioners have proposed. Messrs. A. Rutherford and Co. say, "All manufactured goods imported into Great Britain should pay not less than the percentage paid by similar goods manufactured in Great Britain to local and Imperial taxation, cost of collecting, &c. This would amount to about 25 per cent. on the first cost of the goods." Twenty-five per cent., that is to say, for the most prosperous trades in the United Kingdom. But even 25 per cent. is not enough. "A duty of 40 per cent. would be necessary on German steel forgings to bring the cost up to English prices," say Firm No. 549. Decidedly the business is moving! We have 40 per cent. proposed as a beginning. What will be the proposition once a scale of duties has been drawn up?

#### PREPARING THE LABOUR PARADISE.

*Tariff Reform means More Work.* }  
*Tariff Reform means Higher Wages.* } The DAILY EXPRESS.

Whatever the scientific tariff may do to ensure a man having more work, there can be no pretence that it is going to give him more wages after the admissions which are made by the witnesses



before the Tariff Commission. Nor is the "more work" likely to be accepted with delight when its real character is known. There are pages (one speaks actually and not figuratively) in which witness after witness gives testimony that in protected countries the wages are lower and the hours are longer, and these things are spoken of as "benefits" enjoyed by the foreign manufacturer, but denied to the Englishman. In the Report on engineering the following sentence appears: "One hundred and seventy firms state in general terms that they have suffered owing to longer hours and lower wages abroad. Many of these firms also point out the deleterious consequences of the restrictive attitude of our trade unions." Following this come twelve pages of detailed evidence bearing on lower wages and longer hours.

Engineering, one may imagine the controversialist saying in the last resort, for here the evidence is overwhelmingly against him, is a specialised industry in which we enjoy pre-eminence, and in which wages are high. Turning, then, to the other trades with which the Tariff Commission deals, we take the evidence of a firm engaged in glass-making, which is incorporated in the Commissioners' own summary of the evidence:

Rates of wages are less abroad, and in addition there is more child labour (both sexes) than here, consequently bringing the cost of production much lower. One of the greatest difficulties in our trade in connexion with foreign competition is that in England we work five days a week, putting in sixty hours per week, and obey the Factory Act by not working on Saturdays and Sundays; whereas abroad the foreigners never stop, not even Sunday. Consequently the two days' fuel which we have going up the chimney all the time for no production tells against us with the foreigner, who never stops except for repairs. Englishmen's wages are 50s. for five days, against the foreigners' 20s. for seven days.

Nobody is left under the slightest doubt of what the "more work" of Tariff Reform means, nor what is intended by "better wages"—they are to be better for the manufacturer in the same way as prices are "better" when they are higher. The Tariff Commissioners tell us in their own summary in the glass Report that "the absence of factory legislation, the absence of restrictions on child labour, longer hours of work, Sunday labour, and lower rates of wages are held to constitute great advantages to foreign over British manufacturers." The evidence of one of these witnesses is:

Foreigners with whom I do business tell me that they can obtain labour on the Continent for 2s. 6d. a day of twelve hours, and Saturday the same as any other day, whereas in England they would have to pay 5s. for a day of nine hours for the same description of work.—(William Syer.)

#### EVIDENCE FROM VARIOUS TRADES.

The case is proved amply enough as against glass. As regards iron and steel manufactures it is probably enough to quote the Report of the Commissioners themselves:

Both witnesses and firms replying to the Commission's Inquiry Forms are of opinion that not only are the hours of labour shorter in the United King-

dom than with our competitors, and wages higher (except in the case of the United States), but that the cost of labour per ton in existing conditions is on the whole greater.

There is much evidence in detail that would justify even stronger language than this, but the admission is sufficient. The carpet trade is another of the industries in which longer hours and smaller wages are "enjoyed" abroad, and there are fewer of the "bothersome restrictions" for the protection of the lives and health of the workers. Three extracts from the evidence will serve to illustrate the position :

In all countries from which we experience competition wages are unquestionably at very much lower rates. Hours of labour are longer, with less restrictions.—(Firm No. 3,522.)

In foreign countries they have lower wages and longer hours, and the manufacturers are not subject to so much unnecessary legislative interference.—(Michael Tomkinson.)

Wages are lower and hours of labour longer abroad. We understand the Belgian weaver is paid about 16 francs per week. Our Wilton weavers earn between 30s. and 45s. per week.—(William C. Gray.)

If investigation turns from carpets to sugar and confectionery still the same tale is heard—the foreigner is willing to work longer and for a smaller wage :

Swiss and German wages are lower and longer hours are worked.—(Firm No. 3,839.)

#### COTTON AND WOOL.

Sugar is comparatively a small industry, but cotton takes high rank, and again we discover that the protected trades present the same features in all countries. A few samples of the facts testified by witnesses are quoted :

In Italy the hours worked per week are very much longer than here, and the wages paid are much lower.—(Mr. John P. Dixon.)

The reason we feel the competition of the Belgian manufacturers is that they pay less wages for longer hours of labour than we pay to our workers.—(Firm No. 3,063.)

Wages in foreign Continental countries are lower than ours, and the hours are considerably longer, particularly in Italy, Switzerland, and France.—(T. Middleton and Co., Limited.)

We are beaten by the longer hours worked and lower wages paid to the Continental workmen, and in our American competition by the longer hours and Northrop loom.—(John Baynes.)

France, Belgium, Italy, Switzerland, and America—all with longer hours, and all, with the exception of America, with lower wages! As to the higher wages of America there will be some interesting testimony as regards engineering when we presently return to that report. The position of wool is summarised for us in the Commissioners' report in this manner :

Many witnesses attach much importance to the advantage the French enjoy in the lower French wages and longer hours of labour.

There has been a considerable increase in the sale of Belgian yarns in Scotland, which is attributed to cheaper labour and longer hours.

Legitimately, the only advantage the Dutch have over our English manufacturers is in their lower wages and longer hours.

Next we have Germany added to the growing list of Tariff countries in which the Labour Paradise has already been brought about, and individual testimony as regards wool supports the general conclusion of the report.

A German manufacturer . . . has his 40 per cent. lower wages and longer hours.—(Mr. H. Ives.)

We base our suggestions on the difference of cheapness in labour, especially in Holland, Italian, and German stuffs; the inferior quality of material used, and the facility given to land their goods in this country by exceptionally cheap freights, our carriage from here to London being 70s. per ton, or, say, three times more than the freight of goods from Holland to London.—(Firm No. 5,613.)

My adult male hands get 20s. to 22s. weekly; females, 11s. to 12s. weekly. In Belgium and Germany males get about 12s. and females 7s. weekly; but for this sum they work longer hours than my workpeople.—(Firm No. 4,015.)

Tariff Reform and a wage of twelve shillings a week for a grown man! But then there is the benefit of the long hours.

### THE FACTS ABOUT WAGES.

The further one proceeds in these Reports—which are, it seems almost necessary to repeat, the documents issued by the Tariff Reformers themselves—the more certainly is the talk of higher wages reduced to the shameless flat-catching it is. There is not a shadow of excuse for the misrepresentation. One searches in vain for even an allegation that wages are higher abroad, except in America, and as to the United States there is a general admission that hours are longer and the standard of work more exacting. To these commonplaces of business experience may be added a bit of testimony which is to be found in the engineering Report:

We pay 38s. for fifty-three hours per man; Germany, as far as we can ascertain, for similar work pays 27s. to 30s. and the hours are longer; Austria pays rather less wages, and longer hours are worked; the United States pays 42s. to 44s. for sixty hours' work. . . . Some of our men went to the States to get the higher wages and all but one came back, finding 38s. here better than 44s. there on account of the high prices consequent on Protection.—(Firm No. 1,081.)

That is evidence drawn from actual experience that should be heard from every Free Trade platform in the country.

“There are many general statements,” say the Tariff Commissioners, in reviewing the evidence given as to the pottery industries, “to the effect that wages are lower and the hours of labour longer in foreign competing countries.” It may be added that there are some quite specific statements on the same subject, as, for instance, these:

In foreign countries wages are 25 to 30 per cent. lower, hours of labour are much longer.—(Barker Brothers, Limited.)

The German and Dutch potters work at about 3s. 4d. per day, as against English potters at 5s. to 6s. per day.—(Firm No. 2,488.)

Our wages are considerably higher and our hours of labour much shorter than the same class of workman has in foreign countries. The majority of

our men only work from six to eight hours a day, none more than 9½ hours.—(Charles Dawson and Co.)

Sweden is able to undersell us owing to cheaper rate of wages and longer hours of work.—(The North Bitchburn Coal Company.)

The last statement relates to drain pipes, and the Swedish maker of drain pipes has the benefit of a duty of 10d. per 100 kilogrammes against the foreigner. That certainly, according to the platform formula, should be enough to give higher wages.

### TESTIMONY OF ENGINEERS.

There is no possibility of quoting a tithe of the information on these subjects of wages and hours that may be found in the engineering Report. From the Hon. C. A. Parsons, the inventor of the turbine, who tells us that "the wages of the Swiss workman are a little above one half on the average of the British workman. . . . In Switzerland they work about 30 per cent. longer hours than in England," we turn to some evidence about Germany, whose tariff is the admired example of science in its application to industry :

Mechanical labour in Germany is far cheaper than British, and in most competitive countries they have not the same difficulty to contend with in the shape of labour unions as we have in England. A good mechanic in this country will not work under 10d. per hour. In Germany it is possible to get the same labour for 5s. a day.—(Joseph Richmond and Co.)

From all the information which we can gather we find that our wages are from 50 per cent. to 75 per cent. more than they are in Germany, and we understand that they work much longer hours.—(Hugh J. Scott and Co.)

We have ascertained by actual investigation by a Commissioner whom we despatched to Germany towards the close of 1901 that the rates of wages paid by our principal Continental competitors were from 25 to 33 1-3 per cent. less than our rate of wages in Lancashire, whilst the hours of labour averaged about sixty per week as against our fifty hours.—(Firm No. 956.)

In a German and Dutch shipbuilding yard of our size, and employing about 100 hands, men and boys, their more skilled platers, riveters, and caulkers receive 4s. per day for ten or twelve hours, against our men for nine hours' day receiving 10s., and not satisfied with that. The labourers in a Dutch yard would have about 1s. 8d. or 2s. 1d. per day, against our platers' labourers' 5s. per day.—(Firm No. 690.)

A pause may be made in quotation to think upon the iniquity of British workmen who are "not satisfied" with ten shillings for a day of nine hours, when, with a scientific tariff in operation, they might be revelling in 4s. a day and twelve hours' work. If they happened to be not shipbuilders, but workers in steel shops, their condition under a tariff would be almost as idyllic. This is what the Darlington Forge Company testify on the matter :

The wages of the following classes of workmen are as below, whilst the hours of labour are greater in Germany :

	England.	Germany.
Forgemen .....	20s. to 30s. per day.	10s. to 15s. per day.
Steel smelters .....	10s. to 15s. per day.	6s. to 8s. per day.
Moulders .....	8½d. per hour.	4d. to 6d. per hour.
Fitters, turners, and mechanics	7d. to 8½d. per hour.	4d. to 6d. per hour.

The worker in search of the full benefits of a tariff, if he avoided Germany, might go to Italy to find these conditions :

The wages paid by manufacturers in Italy amount to little more than one-third the amount paid in England, and the number of hours worked per day are regulated by nothing but the individual opinion of the manufacturer.—(The United Asbestos Company.)

France and Germany have made enormous progress in motor-car building, under tariffs which have so benefited labour that the existing conditions are thus described :

The mechanics who in an English motor-car workshop receive 38s. per week would receive not more than 32s., or probably 30s., in Germany. The same remark applies to France.—(The Eagle Engineering and Motor Company.)

Enough has been quoted. Further comment seems superfluous. This is the testimony borne by Tariff Reformers to existing conditions abroad under tariffs. One searches in vain for any evidence in these volumes of higher wages abroad, except in America, and there there is always the qualification of longer hours. Nowhere have tariffs raised the condition of the workman to that which he experiences in England, and the persons who want duties reveal themselves in these volumes looking with wistful eyes to lower wages, longer hours, Sunday labour, the toil of children, and the sweeping away of legislative interference in the management of their factories. The phrase of which we hear so much, "equalising the conditions by a scientific tariff," involves clearly, when analysed, a return to the era before trade unions, Factory Acts, and all the other influences which have raised the worker and his children from the abominations of the past.

#### ON THE SHOULDERS OF THE WORKER.

*If you wish to give a Preference to the Colonies, you must put a tax on food.*—MR. CHAMBERLAIN.

*You must put a tax upon grain and flour if you want to have the markets of Canada, Australia, and South Africa.*—MR. GEORGE WYNDHAM.

"If the food of the people is to be left out," said Mr. Samuel Kidner, a farmer witness before the Tariff Commission, "and other things taxed, it is better to wait until we are all of one mind." Mr. Kidner and those who think with him are under needless apprehension. The food of the people is not to be "left out." Food happens to be one of the things about which the Tariff Commissioners have made up their minds and have arranged their schedule of taxation. The provisional scale of duties has been settled as below :

	<i>General Tariff.</i>	<i>Preferential Tariff.</i>
Wheat.....	{ 6d. per cwt. (or about 2s. per quarter).	{ 3d. per cwt. (or about 1s. per quarter).
Barley, Oats, Rye, Maize, &c.	{ Duties equivalent to those on Wheat.	{ Duties equivalent to those on Wheat.

	<i>General Tariff.</i>	<i>Preferential Tariff.</i>	
Wheaten and other Flour and Meal .....	} 1s. 3d. per cwt.	}	
Animals and Meat, including Bacon .....			} General level to be 5%.
Dairy Produce, including Poultry and Eggs .....	} Specific duties equivalent in general to from 5% to 10% <i>ad val.</i> : though in particular cases some duties when calculated may be found to be lower and in other rather higher than these limits.		
Market-garden Produce, including Potatoes and Hops .....			
Hay and Straw .....			

Wheat, flour, meat, poultry, eggs, potatoes, market-garden produce, hay and straw—the farmer is certainly not to be left out, but it must not be supposed that these proposals have brought him satisfaction. Even while the Commission was sitting there was a repeated demand for higher duties, and some of the witnesses betray that frank selfishness which seems to flourish amain in a Protectionist atmosphere. “A duty of 10 per cent. on dairy produce would be little enough,” says one witness. “The duty would benefit me nearly to the extent of the duty.” A 10 per cent. addition to income would seem to many people to be a sufficiency to draw from the food of the people. But 10 per cent. is not enough for some others, even if the whole benefit is going into their pockets. “If a duty of from 15 per cent. to 20 per cent. be put on meat and dairy produce,” says Form No. 12,696, “it would be of some substantial benefit to me.” There is a suggestion that the present duties on the food of the people are only to be regarded as a first move. Mr. W. B. Blundell states: “Mr. Chamberlain’s suggestions don’t go far enough to benefit agriculture, *but I regard them as the first step in the right direction.*”

#### A DEMAND FOR BOUNTIES.

Higher duties are asked for, in the belief that the farmers will benefit in pocket, but these do not suffice to satisfy the claims of the agriculturists. Farmer after farmer proposes that the revenue raised in this way shall not be applied to general taxation or to the reduction of duties upon commodities like tea and tobacco, but to the payment of a bounty on wheat-growing or the reduction of taxation upon farm lands. One of the proposals runs:

These duties should form a fund for the granting of a bounty to agriculture in the shape of a direct payment for all home-grown wheat produced or (and preferably) the removal of all rates and taxes upon agricultural land. If something in this direction is not done it would seem probable that the last state of the farmer, and the wheat-grower especially, will be worse than the first.—(Mr. J. W. Dennis.)

Another equally outspoken declaration is:

The duties proposed upon agricultural imports are so small that they will not be felt. They will be of no benefit whatever unless a grant is made for reduction of local rates.—(Mr. J. Clarke.)



There is, however, no business in which opinion is in such confusion as to duties and their effects as in agriculture. One finds the farmers each fighting for his own hand, according to the produce he can obtain from his farms, the millers urging their special claims, the growers of meat opposing the graziers, and the dairy people anxious mainly for cheap foodstuffs. Thus, to take the position of maize, upon which the Commission proposes a duty although both Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Wyndham have declared for no duty, we find the supporters of a tax divided into three classes—namely, (1) Those who use maize for feeding and want no tax; (2) those who wish maize for feeding to be free, but maize for brewing to pay a duty; and (3) those who cannot see why maize should escape. Examples of the third opinion run :

I do not see why maize should be excluded. It is used a great deal in some districts for the feeding of cattle and so forth. It is made into bread to a certain extent, and the millers use a portion of it. I think it is quite right that if the duty was put on barley and not on maize the brewers would use nothing but maize. If it is put on one thing it should be put on the other.—(Mr. G. E. Daintree.)

Personally, I do not agree with maize being exempted. I look upon maize as the greatest competitor with all the second-grade cereals that the English farmer produces, and a duty on maize would not affect the poor man at all.—(Mr. P. F. Astill.)

“Maize should not be taxed,” says Mr. C. F. Paddison, whose view is repeated by a score other witnesses. “I should like to see the brewer pay a duty on the maize that he uses,” states Mr. T. Casswell; “it cuts into our barley trade considerably.” The brewer seems to have no friends. Amid such curious differences of opinion and testimonies as to actual fact, the scientist with his tariff may well stand in bewilderment.

#### FEAR OF HIGHER RENTS.

Maize is but an example of the differences of view that exist. The host of witnesses who want a higher duty on live cattle than on dead meat, are confronted by another host who want the heavier tax upon the dressed animals. Behind these are a suspicious band who, believing that duties will increase their incomes, see the whole extra amount going into the pockets of the landlords. “If the land made more rent the landlords would get the advantage, not the tenant,” says Mr. T. S. Corpe; and there is much other evidence of the same opinion in these passages :

The landlord would be able to get a little more rent as the effect of all the duties combined.—(Mr. G. Fiske.)

If prices are raised on an apparent permanent basis, their increase will in great part be discounted on any re-arrangement of rent.—(Mr. J. Speir.)

Any duty would tend to make landlords demand more rent.—(Mr. E. M. Nunneley.)

Labour and rents will rise.—(Form No. 12,412.)

Here we are among the farmers who are not to be deluded by any promise of duties. A particularly outspoken member of the class is Mr. A. T. Drake, who says :

There are many silly short-sighted farmers who only regard import duties as extra income, and do not grasp that the announcement of import duties will create an unwarrantable competition for land by tradesmen unpractised in agriculture, and others who would be farmers. This will harden rents beyond a living rent, so that the sitting farmer will have perhaps to leave his holding, or surely dwindle out, leaving the landlords after a feast of hope to face a débâcle, as they had to do in the early eighties. Feeding stuffs free from competition by protected corn will go higher, machinery will be dearer, and the labourers are practically promised to have more money. It is the duty of a real honest Government to thoroughly forecast the possible plight of the farmer, and not to establish import duties unless they are able to give him sufficient privileges wherewith to meet these fresh charges that will then come upon him.

Mr. Drake is of the men who see little benefit in the proposals of the Tariff Commission. There are others who see none at all. "Fifty-three farmers in various parts of the United Kingdom," says the summary of the evidence, "state in so many words that the proposed duty would be of no benefit to them, and some of them oppose the change in the general interests of the community." Certain farmers state their objection at greater length:

I fail to see any advantage; if we get a little more for our corn, other things we have to purchase will cost us more.—(Mr. J. Suggitt.)

Anything that makes corn, cake, or any feeding stuff dearer will handicap me in producing meat; also manures, such as guano, if taxed, would handicap me growing fruit and hops. Any duty is so much more freight or railway carriage to pay. As I have no desire to go back to corn-growing, any duty will do me harm.—(Mr. A. Amos.)

The recent shilling duty on wheat took £50 per annum out of my pocket because it raised the price of all my purchased feeding stuffs from 5s. to 8s. per ton, without any corresponding benefit to me.—(Form No. 12,156.)

Looking at it broadly, it seems to me the farmer stands to lose in any case.—(Form No. 12,450.)

Mr. Chamberlain's proposal would put us in the position of the farmer of the Western States of America. He lives under high protection for everything he has to buy, and Free Trade for what he has to sell.—(Mr. J. P. Poe.)

There would naturally be higher rents, dearer labour, and everything which I purchased would be dearer. I should be in a worse position than I am at present.—(Mr. J. C. Dawson.)

## THE BURDEN OF THE LABOURER.

Confusion of thought manifests itself on nearly every page of the report on agriculture. The man who is at pains to express the belief that prices will not go higher under duties is certain that he will get more money in some mysterious way. But there are farmers who have a clearer vision of things. Mr. George A. Elliott thinks that he would benefit if the duty increased the price of his produce, "and it most decidedly would if big enough." What, then, of the labourer? "I do not quite know," responds this witness, "how the labourers would obtain a share of that benefit, for with farming as it is now I should say decidedly their wages could not rise for some considerable time." But the labourer, meanwhile, on the same wage, would be paying those higher prices. Certainly there is a want of inspiration in this message to the cottage. Possibly the labourer is to look for his reward in a better price for the pig which he feeds on maize which has been



raised in price by a tax. But Mr. Chamberlain has promised to exempt bacon from a tax, although his Commission has decided against him on that point. Whichever is the ultimate decision, the labourer is not better off as regards his pig, and if there is no duty he is worse off. The scientific tariff is even at this stage betraying a tendency to settle with all its weight upon his shoulders.

If the labourer is allowed little doubt that he will have to bear the edifice of the duties, the report itself presents us with a picture of an unedifying scramble to get some benefit for oneself and thrust the burden on one's neighbour. The farmer who grows corn wants a duty on corn, the man who feeds cattle wants corn to come in free, so that he may have cheap offal, and he asks further for a duty on meat; the miller would like free corn and a duty on flour, and everybody seems agreed that if benefits spring from these conflicting proposals the landlord will get more rent. That is the summit of the edifice—the landlord. And at the bottom is the labourer, feeding his pig on taxed foods, and paying more for all he buys. Somewhere in-between comes the consumer, who is not working on the land but is paying the duties, while the farmer who gathers a large part of the benefit boldly claims that the extra money paid for foreign and colonial produce should give him a bounty or wipe out his rates.

#### PREFERENCE AND ITS DOUBLE FACE.

*A system of Preferential Tariffs is the only system by which the Empire can be kept together.*—MR. CHAMBERLAIN, June 26, 1903.

*A two-shilling tax on wheat, with a preference to our Colonies, will be followed not by a rise but by a fall in the price of bread.*—MR. WYNDHAM December 9, 1903.

Confusion of a very serious kind is created in the tariff controversy by the want of an exact nomenclature. "Preference" is used indifferently to mean the reduction of duties allowed by certain Colonies on British goods, and to cover a proposal to erect a tariff wall in this country in order that we may then take away a portion of its height and create a gap through which Colonial products can flow. In the one case we have an attempt to make trade more free than it would otherwise be; in the other an endeavour to make it more difficult for goods, whether Colonial or foreign, to get into this country. The distinction was one very plainly present to the minds of the gentlemen who drew up the schedules of questions upon which the reports of the Tariff Commission are based. Those businesses which have benefited by the Canadian and South African preferences are invited to declare their favourable experiences; those which depend largely on Colonial raw materials are asked little or nothing of their views regarding a tariff on those raw materials, with or without a preference. Take wool as an example. We get wool in huge quantities from Australia and South Africa. If those Colonies are to be benefited by preference a tax on wool in addition to that on

mutton is certain to be asked for. But the Commissioners avoid the subject of a tax or a preference on wool, and talk only of the benefits of the Colonial preference upon woollen manufactures. This, although they had evidence before them that Australia is at present competing against the English rug manufacturers both at home and in the Colonies! Firm No. 1,613 says:

Our Australian Colonies are now competing against us with rugs in London market and at prices under what we can do a legitimate trade at. In recent years our trade has fallen off there, as we cannot make headway against 35 per cent. duty.

Other evidence states that "much ready-made clothing is imported into South Africa from Australia." Without any preference at all, then, Australia is making its way into our markets, not with its wool alone, but with its woollen goods.

#### FARMERS WHO ARE NOT FOOLED.

If wool and the other raw materials which the Empire produces are to be left asking for a preference in vain, food is in a different position. There are to be, under the Tariff Reform scheme, taxes on food with a preference to the Colonies. Mr. Wyndham, however, has done his best to assure the food consumers that the duties will reduce the price of bread, and the English farmer is left wondering how he is to benefit. The farmer, however, is not quite such a fool as Mr. Wyndham would have us believe him. In a great majority those who gave evidence before the Tariff Commission welcome the food duties because they will enable them to get better prices for their produce. There are some, indeed, who have no desire whatever to see the Colonies benefit. They regard these extra charges on bread and meat as their part of the plunder. A few extracts of evidence will illustrate the point:

I protest against any Colonial preference. Colonial corn ought to be taxed equally. The Colonies don't help to pay our taxes and heavy rates.—(Lord Kesteven.)

The admission of Colonial corn free is the weak part of the scheme. I do not believe in giving preference to relations in matters of trade.—(A. Pulling.)

From a farmer's point of view, there should be no preference to the Colonies.—(J. Richards.)

The admission of Colonial produce free would be a serious disadvantage to our agriculturists, who pay rent, rates, and taxes, whereas in the Colonies there are no such burdens on the land.—(Form No. 12,123.)

#### "NOT OF THE SLIGHTEST ADVANTAGE."

Here we are in hard contact with what may be called one face of the Preference issue—the giving of an advantage to the Colonies, and many of those who are asked to surrender even a part of the Protection for which they have hoped are strongly opposed to the plan. There are others who put the case much in the same way as does Mr. Wyndham, but what to him seems a pleasing and satisfactory feature in the play of tariffs becomes to them a serious drawback:

The preference given to the Colonial farmer as against the foreigner may so stimulate Colonial production as to make competition with home produce in time even greater than it has been hitherto.—(David Hume.)

Supposing Colonial corn was admitted free of duty, English farmers would be quite as much swamped at at present.—(Form No. 12,215.)

I would not let in Canadian cattle free. How would you prevent American cattle being shipped from Canadian ports?—(C. N. Humble.)

If the Colonies are able to take full advantage of this preference, the British farmer will reap no benefit, as the Colonies will supply England with corn instead of the Americans.—(W. E. S. Wilson.)

The bent of mind of these farmers is summed up in the emphatic declaration of Mr. F. Martin: "Mr. Chamberlain's proposals are not of the slightest advantage to the British agriculturist."

That is one side of the matter of Preferential tariffs. One would like to investigate it further, but there rises up a blank wall. One gets among the evidence relating to manufactures, and here it is taken as an axiom that absolutely raw materials are not to be penalised by a tariff, and witnesses and Commissioners alike turn their eyes to Preference, as it consists in a reduction of Colonial duties. Even here, however, one does not find much sentiment wasted. Mr. Benn, who gives evidence on the woollen industry, does so in truculent mood:

I should put on a fighting tariff. I am convinced nothing else would do. I should certainly include the Colonies in the scope of such a tariff. . . . And there should be no misconception as to the actual effect of preferences granted us by the Colonies, who seem to forget that in many cases the minimum duty on British manufactures is protective and sometimes even prohibitive in its effect, thus reducing preference to a farce.

Other examples of evidence on the same lines, although scarcely expressed with the same vigour, are:

I am convinced that we need not consider that the Colonies would give us the slightest preference over foreign-made goods if we are a fraction higher in price than they are. Their patriotism stops short of their pocket, which I regard as a necessity in face of the ever-increasing competition.—(Firm No. 10,060.)

Our difficulty would be that though the Colonies would give preference to us against our foreign competitors they will not protect us against themselves. We cannot get Free Trade with them. They ask us to give them something, and I am afraid they would not give us much in return.—(Mr. Viccars.)

#### PREFERENCE WITHOUT BENEFITS.

The preceding quotations are from the Report on woollen manufactures, but similar evidence is found as regards other industries. Thus, as regards cotton, the testimony of certain firms is:

The adoption of a preferential system would encourage our Colonies taking more of our goods; but I should give the Colonies no preference over those countries that would allow our goods to go into their ports free.—(Mr. Alfred Butterworth.)

In Canada the preference does not affect us. We cannot get any of our goods into Canada.—(Mr. C. E. Middleton.)

The Canadian preference has not helped me; and never will, as long as it is laid down as first principle that the tariff is always high enough to keep me

out. The promise of high duties against other countries deceives nobody—it is only political window-dressing.—(William Anderson and Co., Limited.)

The last-quoted firm is strongly Free Trade, as might be supposed, and therefore in the eyes of Tariff Reformers, no doubt, does not count. But its evidence is given with a refreshing independence which strikes a manly note amid the scramble of interests each striving to get something out of the tariffs. There is another firm (No. 10,021) which writes: "I am opposed to preferential tariffs on the ground that they are apt to dull energy and enterprise."

In most of the manufacturing trades there is, as might be expected, quite convincing evidence that the 33 1-3 per cent. preference in Canada has been an advantage, but there are many firms which ascribe the improvement as much to the prosperity of the Colony as to the partial lowering of the duty. Thus, in regard to cotton, we have these statements:

Since Canada conceded the preference tariff our trade has increased, although I am not inclined to say it is the tariff that has caused this. My belief is it is more the prosperity of the Dominion.—(Mr. A. K. Innes.)

I do not think the preference that we have is the reason why we have exported more to Canada than in other years, but the lower class of goods being in fashion, and not being produced in Canada so much, we have been enabled to export more of that class.—(Witness No. 44.)

#### ENTIRE EXCLUSION FROM CANADA.

There is much other testimony, however, which explains why there is no enthusiasm for preference, even when it means an apparent lowering of Canadian duties. Some examples from the Report on engineering are worthy of notice:

The Canadian preference of 33 1-3 per cent. is not sufficient. The high duty, 10 per cent. to 15 per cent., shuts us out. The Canadian manufacturer is protected by the duty, and the freight rate is so high that we cannot compete.—(Mr. A. Bornemann.)

In Canada it makes no difference, as 35 per cent. less one-third still shuts us out completely.—(The Quadrant Cycle Company.)

When the goods are manufactured in Canada we find the preference is quite ineffective, as the tariff is put so high as (even with the preference) to prevent such goods being imported at all.—(Firm No. 1,503.)

Our export trade has never had a chance against the prohibitive duty in Canada and the United States. The preferential rebate given by Canada, as far as our goods are concerned, would appear somewhat sarcastic.—(Firm No. 845.)

So with silk one firm testifies:

It is the tariff the Australians put on the English manufactured goods which prevents our goods being able to compete with their own productions, so unless they are willing to have Free Trade with England it is doubtful, I think, whether we could successfully compete.—(Ellis and Co.)

In regard to confectionery there is stronger evidence that the preference in practice means little or nothing:

We find that our Colonies protect themselves so highly that we can do no trade with them, the small preference given to this country being not nearly sufficient.—(A. Lyle and Sons.)

The duties have generally been fixed so high on confectionery that even with the preference the wall is insurmountable, except for special lines, and we rather think these would go over the fence anyhow.—(Clarke, Nickolls, and Coombs, Limited.)

### “THANK YOU FOR NOTHING.”

Mr. W. A. Smith, whose evidence as an engineer has been previously quoted, cares nothing for the preferences offered, observing :

A preference of even 75 per cent. is not the same thing as no duty. A preference given to us by the Colonies is to our advantage, and consequently to the disadvantage of the inhabitants of the particular Colony which gives the preference. If that preference is to be purchased by crippling us in other directions in regard to our world's trade, then I say, “Thank you for the Imperial trade. I prefer the world's trade. I would rather have the substance I have than the shadow which is offered.” If the Colonies were to offer me a preferential duty off their ordinary import duty and I had to purchase that by having to pay an import duty on my raw materials, I would say, “Thank you for nothing,” because I should lose a great deal more than I could possibly gain by any trade that we shall do in the Colonies.

Perhaps the true basis of affairs is most directly put by Firm No. C. 4,670, who say in returning their form of answers : “Preferential rates with our Colonies are desirable, and Free Trade with them would be best of all; but if to attain this it will necessitate any duty on food or raw material, it will be an unmitigated evil and very detrimental to the businesses I am associated with.” Detrimental or not, the Tariff Commissioners have decided on the food taxes.

Thus are presented the two aspects of preference. The farmers on the one side are seen only willing to give a preference when they are convinced that the duty is to be paid by the consumer, and in some proportion to themselves. Where they accept Mr. Wyndham's view that preference will reduce prices, they protest energetically against any such concession. The manufacturers, on the other hand, are for the most part eager for the lowering of the tariff walls of the Colonies, but not fully persuaded that what has been done has been an entire advantage, and the Tariff Commissioners are careful not to ask these gentlemen to define the preferences which they are prepared to give the Colonies in return for the boons they seek. Where they do express an opinion on the matter, they are, for the most part, willing that the preference should be given on food, so long as their own raw materials are left untouched. The whole position is a round game in which all parties are seeking benefits for themselves and proposing to pass the account for payment to their neighbours.

### ATTITUDE TOWARDS TRADE UNIONISM.

The “science” of the Tariff Commission is the “science” of higher prices for everything. This additional drain on the worker's pocket is to be met by more regular employment, bringing with it better wages. In discussing the “labour paradise” it has been

shown not only that tariffs mean longer hours, less wages, fewer holidays, and frequently Sunday labour, but that a considerable section of those who are seeking to establish a tariff regard these things as a part of the benefit to be conferred upon them by the change. The same spirit is seen working in other directions. It finds expression in a dislike of trade unions, because they maintain wages and keep down hours; it is resentful because restrictions as to labour conditions are imposed in contracts and have then to be carried out. The "scientist" who wants Protection for his own industry wants equally to be able to purchase his labour in the cheapest market. Even when he accepts a Government contract which plainly specifies fair conditions he is outraged. Take this bit of evidence from the report on the woollen industry :

I have here in my hand the "fair labour contract" clause of the Bradford Corporation. It covers two pages; it was given to me when I tendered for a Bradford tramway contract. Did ever anybody read such a thing as that? They can come and seize your plant and sell it or run it, or do what they like, if you do not pay trade union wages for three months before you start and during the contract. There is no free trade about it.—(Mr. Albrecht.)

Complaints with regard to the action of the trade unions in raising wages and keeping bad firms to the level of the better employers are fairly frequent. Thus, one witness testifies with regard to affairs at Huddersfield :

The action of trade unions works disadvantageously to our trade; it does not help the workpeople in the long run, though their scale of wages has gone up. Their action has a tendency to keep the wages at one general level, that is, to put one manufacturer on the same footing as another, in the same class of goods as regards wages. If there is one lower than another, they lift him up to the highest. They restrict output, by refusing to allow persons to work two looms. They ignore the improvement that there has been in looms and in machinery—the mechanism of looms—and because it was the system twenty or thirty years ago to have one man one loom, or one woman one loom, it must remain so to-day. In the United States the workman does as much work as he possibly can, and wants to get ahead. Here the workman is not allowed to earn more than a certain amount. We have always had trade unions in our district, but they are stronger than ever they were.—(Mr. Learoyd.)

Mr. Learoyd is a gentleman who claims that his goods are "the Bond-street style," and wants a 10 per cent. duty. "Our class of goods is only bought by those who can well afford to pay." Nothing, it may be parenthetically remarked, is so wonderful as the extent of the classes which "can well afford to pay," according to the evidence of the manufacturers.

#### MORE IMPORTANT THAN A TARIFF.

To some employers this matter of getting rid of trade union restrictions and factory legislation looms up as more important than a tariff itself. "Unless," say Messrs. Corry and Co., who give evidence on the glass industry, "a system of free labour is introduced in this country, and the tyranny of the trade unions swept away, so that men can work longer hours if they wish, and the best men can be brought to the front, there is very



little hope for any material increase in our exports to foreign countries, tariffs or no tariffs." Messrs. Moore, Nettlefold, and Co. express their view thus :

We think a great deal need be said about the disadvantages we suffer in England from the effects of trade unionism, and the absence of proper laws to compel the English workman to render faithful service.

Not only is the worker to be deprived of the advantage of his trade union; in the ideal condition of affairs under the scientific tariff the State is to send a policeman to see that he does as much as he possibly can in the hours during which he is working. Why the glassmakers should be anxious to get rid of the trade union is plain from the evidence of Mr. L. J. Murray, who says :

For eight turns our workmen get £3 10s. to £4 a week, as compared with Continental wages where a man equivalent to my man instead of getting £4 would receive about 25s., and produce as much work by working longer hours.

#### PAYING WAGES ON THE RACK.

"The French manufacturer," say the Tariff Commissioners in summarising the evidence regarding the lace industry, "is also greatly aided by lower wages, longer hours of work, and the absence of trade union restrictions designed to increase the standard of comfort among the workers." Obviously, it follows that if this be true a simple tariff is not enough. The French manufacturer has his tariff; give the English maker the same, and he is still faced by the difficulties of higher wages, shorter hours, and the trade union restrictions designed to increase the standard of comfort among the workers. Get rid of all these and then competition will be equal. It is, perhaps, scarcely a matter for surprise that, while these matters crop up from time to time among the evidence, they find no place in the recommendations. "We pay by the rack," wails Firm No. 3,720, in discussing wages. There is a horrible picture of the manufacturer under Free Trade being tortured to give his workmen a better standard of living! "The absence of effective factory legislation in Continental countries," observes the summary, "is spoken of as another cause working to the disadvantage of the British manufacturer, who has to conform to a far higher standard in this respect." Again that word "disadvantage" is employed—it is a "disadvantage" to the British manufacturer that he has to give his workers a decent and healthy place in which to work. "The absence of factory legislation, the absence of restriction on child labour, longer hours of work, Sunday labour, and lower rates of wages are held to constitute great advantages to foreign over British manufacturers," observes the report on glass. Add a tariff, and there would seem to be no end to these "advantages" of the manufacturer. "They have freedom from Factory Act interference," says the firm of Robert Paul, in comparing their own hard lot with that of the German manufacturers. Firm No. 4,960 wants a 30s. a ton duty on glass bottles, and adds :

We also require from 5 to 10 per cent. to counterbalance the Factory Acts, Sunday work, exchange profit, the liberality of our laws, and our heavy rents.

### PROTECTION AGAINST LEAD POISONING.

One of the most beneficent fields of labour legislation has been in protecting pottery workers against slow death from lead poisoning. The scientific tariff has something to say to that, and this is what it is :

Continental manufacturers are not hampered by stringent rules as to lead glazing as we are. The British manufacturer has to incur very heavy expense in insurance against, and means to protect his workpeople from, the dangers of lead-poisoning, also in carrying out the Factory and Employers' Liability Acts.

The restoration of a pleasant freedom to poison by lead is a boon the manufacturers need not hope for, tariff or no tariff. In regard to cotton there is the same outcry against restrictions made for the health of the workers. "Several firms," we are told, "are of opinion that factory legislation in existing circumstances is a disadvantage in increasing cost. One firm even goes so far as to say that the increased cost due to this cause has been a more important factor in the decline of the cotton industry than foreign tariffs." And the amazing thing is that this self-same report speaks of benighted Russia as making a beginning with those very restrictions that at least one English firm wishes to shake off. One further piece of evidence must be quoted in this place—without it the record would be incomplete. A firm complains that two foreign markets have been closed :

We do not find these two blows, heavy as they are, anything like so serious as the persecuting legislation by the home Government, for which the cotton trade alone of non-dangerous trades appears to have been of late years singled out. In our opinion, this hostile and often unnecessary legislation—as distinguished from that which is necessary—has done as much as foreign tariffs to reduce this fine industry to one of mere existence in this country.—(Form No. 6,187.)

These last witnesses were cotton-spinners, and they were giving evidence of the "mere existence" of an industry which had entered upon years of wonderful prosperity. There could scarcely be a better example of the point made on an earlier page that many of the witnesses who speak as experts and clamour for Protection are palpably ignorant of the conditions of their own business.

### SHACKLES UPON INDUSTRY.

A very little more must suffice to show that trade unionism and factory legislation are lumped together by the Tariffites as shackles upon their industry. "The foreign manufacturer, printer, dyer, or finisher is not troubled with trade unionism," says Mr. John P. Dixon, who speaks for cotton. Of the 170 firms in the engineering industry who complain of the longer hours and lower wages abroad the Tariff Commission observes : "Many of these firms also point out the deleterious consequences of the restrictive attitude of



our trade unions." The following are selected pieces of evidence from this industry :

We consider that trade organisations and the regulations of the Factory and Workshops Act and Employers' Liability Act undoubtedly tend to enhance the prices of home manufactures.

In Germany, with lower wages and longer hours, they get more work out of their men than we do because they are more under control. In cases of strikes the military are immediately made use of.

A momentary digression may be pardoned for pointing out that we have already travelled from the gentleman who wants the policeman to be called in to make the workman toil to the manufacturer who sees salvation in employing the military.

In regard to hosiery, as in respect to engineering, there is the same attitude towards the trade union. "Foreign competitors are also less hampered by trade-union restrictions than we are," says one great firm. "The goods are cheaper," declares another, "because the manufacturer has no trade unions, pays less wages, and the hours of work are longer." "The Factory Act fetters us in regard to employment, particularly of women," says Mr. Brinton, giving evidence as regards carpets.

Possible quotation is not exhausted, but sufficient has been given to show that the "scientist" will not be content with a mere countervailing duty which takes notice only of the tariffs of other countries. The duty must be sufficient to cover all increase of cost from trade-union wages and from factory legislation, or there must be a free hand to sweep these things away. The military must be called in. On the one hand we have a prospect opened out of high and ever-rising duties; on the other of workmen coerced to do a certain amount of work under the conditions and at the wage that the employer chooses to give. The scientific tariff is not only a method of penalising the consumer; it is to become also a conspiracy to rob labour of the advantages it has gained. It is to be a weapon against which Factory Act and trade union will alike be powerless.

#### A SUMMARY OF DISCLOSURES.

In beginning this examination of the reports of the Tariff Commission the intention was to go behind the actual findings of the Commissioners, and by reading the evidence to discover what was in the minds of the witnesses, who are the people with whom the country will have to deal in the framing of a tariff, if ever that work should be entered upon. As was to be anticipated, the witnesses in many cases were found to be already asking for duties far in excess of those which Mr. Chamberlain had advocated, and, indeed, protesting that these high duties were absolutely necessary to the existence of the industries concerned. In a number of instances it was urged that the people buying the goods "could well afford to pay," a view of the situation which may not be so palatable to the consumer as the manufacturers clearly believe it to be. Beyond this clamour for high duties, however, other inte-

resting points were disclosed. In the first place the Tariff Commission itself, after boldly setting out with schedules of duties on iron and steel, on cotton goods, and on corn and meat, took refuge in vague generalities or mere summaries of the evidence when the other industries were approached. As soon as a point was reached where the promised duties were found to be operating upon the raw materials of other industries, the attempt to balance between the different claims was abandoned. The engineers and shipbuilders were not asked for their opinion of duties upon iron and steel; the cotton manufacturers heard nothing of the proposed impost upon flour, which has a very considerable bearing on their business. To each trade was presented the roseate suggestion of a duty upon the goods competing with its products; even in cases where a schedule of taxes upon the raw materials of that industry had already been drafted it was kept in the background. The Tariff Commission has promised, at some indefinite date, a Report illustrating how the different trades will be affected by the proposed duties. That Report, it is safe to say, may be looked for far in the future. The documents issued so far dangle before manufacturers the suggestion that they will be able to sell all they make behind the protection of a tariff wall and obtain all they buy at the prices of Free Trade.

#### THE DUTIES ON FOOD.

Upon one important matter the Commission reached very definite conclusions. The agriculturists were a powerful body, and they knew what they wanted. The result is seen in a schedule of duties upon all forms of agricultural produce. Whatever else happens, the scientists of the Tariff have decided that the food of the people shall be taxed. Duties are proposed on all the following articles :

Wheat.	Potatoes.	Bacon.
Barley.	Hops.	Poultry.
Oats.	Vegetables.	Eggs.
Rye.	Live Animals.	Butter.
Maize.	Beef.	Dairy Produce.
Flour.	Mutton.	Hay.
Meal.	Pork.	Straw.

Even maize and bacon, both of which were exempted by Mr. Chamberlain, are included. All the "science" of Victoria Street, in fact, has not carried us beyond the declaration of Mr. Chamberlain, "You must put a tax on food."

All pretence that tariffs will benefit the workers goes down before the evidence given by the various witnesses. Many of these are found expressing the belief that in some mysterious way there will be an advantage to the labourer, but there is no suggestion that in countries possessing tariffs the worker is better off. On the contrary, the whole of the testimony is to the effect that in tariff countries, with the exception of the United States, wages are lower, hours are longer, factory conditions are worse, Sunday

labour is common, more women are employed, and children still have their young lives stunted by hard labour at an age when in England they are at the school desk. On their own showing the Tariff Reformers stand condemned of a hideous misrepresentation. They confess that tariffs have not produced conditions anything like as good as those that obtain under Free Trade, and they make it a complaint that they have to compete against labour conditions so poor that, as one witness put it, they are a more serious factor in competition than the tariff itself.

The scientific tariff reveals itself as a conspiracy against labour conditions, but it is more. Its exponents complain of the power of trade unions and of the beneficent operations of the factory inspector backed by the Factory Acts. These are difficulties, they tell us, that the foreign manufacturer has not to face.

### PRESSURE OF THE DUTIES.

It remains to deal with some of the hard facts that the Tariff Commission has avoided. Definite duties are proposed on food-stuffs, on iron and steel manufactures, and on cotton goods. Even these limited duties are not simple things. They touch the national life and the national industry at every point; they extend their influence into the remotest corners. The proposed duties on corn and food-stuffs generally affect not only every being in the country as direct consumer. They impose a charge upon every trade which uses flour or any of the materials upon which a tax is proposed. They would hit, among others :

- The farmer who feeds stock.
- The owner of horses employed for any purpose whatever.
- The feeder of pigs and of poultry.
- The brewer.
- The baker and confectioner.
- The cotton manufacturer.

These are but a few of the trades which jump immediately to the mind.

With iron the duties would be equally far-reaching. From the shipbuilder who buys plates to the joiner who buys nails everybody is more or less dependent on iron or steel. Pig-iron, which is the finished article of one industry, is but the raw material of another, which in its turn is making the raw material for a third. A few of the articles that would be raised in price by a duty on iron and steel are :

- Girders for bridges and buildings.
- Steel plates and iron sections of all kinds for shipbuilding.
- Steel rails.
- Locomotives and engines of all types.
- Tools, whether for the hand or the elaborate and costly automatic instruments necessary for the higher grades of engineering manufactures.
- Guns and weapons of all kinds.
- Bicycles and motor-cars.
- All iron portions of carriages and other vehicles.
- Horse-shoes and nails.

Fire-grates and gas-stoves.

Cast-iron baths, galvanised cisterns, &c.

Wrought-iron lamps, gas fittings, &c.

Gas-piping.

Machinery of every description, from the domestic sewing-machine to the engines of a *Dreadnought*.

A thousand other examples of the employment of iron and steel might be quoted, and all would, more or less, be affected adversely.

#### THE DUTY ON MEAT.

The duty on meat would raise the price of that product, but it would be far more serious in its effect upon the many industries which depend upon the offal of cattle for their raw materials. These include :

Tanner.

Harness-maker.

Leather-workers of all kinds.

Boot and shoe-maker.

Furniture manufacturer.

Carriage-builders.

Manufacturers of all articles in bone and in horn, such as knife-handles, spoons, children's toys, &c.

Machinery-belt makers.

Bone button-cutters.

Glue and gelatine manufacturers.

Artificial manure makers.

Tripe-dressers.

There is no pretence here of a complete list; hundreds of other instances of the employment of leather, horn, bone, and the other by-products of animals might be added. The shipbuilder whose iron plates pay a duty must also add a percentage to the cost of his machinery, his tools, his leather belting, and all the other materials of his business. He will get no more for his ships. The engine-builder, who may get a higher price for his finished product, will see the whole of it absorbed by the added cost of his works, even before he contemplates those higher wages to his workmen which have been so lavishly promised. The cotton manufacturer must pay more not only for his machines, but for everything, except cotton, that he uses. His power of competition abroad, which is his great market, will at once be diminished. So the thing goes on in an evil cycle of progress, everything being raised in cost, an additional handicap in competing abroad being imposed, and the ultimate financial result of home trade being precisely where it was.

#### PROTECTION UNDER A CLOAK.

At the bottom of the whole scheme of tariffs stands the worker, bearing the full burden. For him the message of the scientific tariff is a message of increased cost of his food, of his clothes, of the tools with which he works, and of the materials which he makes up. If he still believes that his conditions will improve and his wages be higher, he will find in the reports of the Tariff Commission itself the evidence that he is already better off than his competitors in tariff countries, and many indications that a section

at least of those who are most clamorous for duties also turn jealous eyes to the conditions abroad in which a harder life and lower pay for the worker are counted as the "advantages" which the foreigner enjoys. Nor may he console himself with reflections about the benefits to Colonial trade, for while the Tariff Commission still clings to Preference its witnesses are unwilling to give Preference where they are hurt by it, and others find that the "Preference" accorded by the Colonies shuts them out as effectually as if no Preference were given. The "scientific tariff" is, in fact, no more than naked Protection clumsily trying to hide its shame under a cloak of modern investigation.

PRINTED BY  
CASSELL & COMPANY, LIMITED, LA BELLE SAUVAGE,  
LONDON, E.C.

# COBDEN CLUB PUBLICATIONS.

---

## PAMPHLETS.

- The A B C of Free Trade.** By E. N. BUXTON. Price 3d.
- The Balance of Free Trade.** By THE RIGHT HON. G. SHAW-LEFEVRE. Price 3d.
- Cobden's Work and Opinions.** By LORD WELBY and Sir LOUIS MALET. Price 1d.
- A Short Life of Richard Cobden.** By FRANCES E. COOK. Price 1d.
- Free Trade and the English Farmer.** By "ONE OF HIS FRIENDS." Price 3d.
- Why Danish Farmers are Free Traders.** By A. PESCHCKE KOEDT. Price 3d.
- Things Seen and Things Not Seen.** Translated from the French of F. BASTIAT. Price 3d.
- The Effect of Protection on Wages.** By the late LORD PLAYFAIR. Price 1d.
- Fact versus Fiction: The Cobden Club's Reply to Mr. Chamberlain.** Price 1d.
- Shipping and Free Trade.** By RUSSELL REA, M.P. Price 3d.
- The Lessons of History on Free Trade and Protection.** By Sir SPENCER WALPOLE. Price 2d.
- The Two Theories of Foreign Trade.** By RUSSELL REA, M.P. Price 3d.
- Cobden on the Land Question: A Plea for Small Holdings.** Price 3d.
- The Fruits of American Protection.** By J. A. HOBSON. Price 3d.
- India and the New Fiscal Scheme.** By S. M. MITRA, M.R.A.S. Price 3d.
- Cobden Club Dinner; February 22nd, 1907. Report of Speeches.** Price 3d.
- Empire Commerce.** By EDWARD PULSFORD, Member of the Commonwealth Senate. Price 3d.
- The Colonial Conference: The Cobden Club's Reply to the Preferential Proposals.** Price 6d.
- Cobden Club Dinner; July 4th, 1907. Report of Speeches.** Price 3d.
- What Colonial Preference Means.** 3d.
- Sentiment the Bond of Empire.** 3d.
- Free Trade.** By LORD AVEBURY. 3d.
- Insular Free Trade, Theory and Experience.** By RUSSELL REA, M.P. 6d.
- The Case against Protection.** By E. COZENS COOKE. 3d.
- 
- Tariff Makers: Their Aims and Methods.** A Sequel to Fact *v.* Fiction. Price 1s.

CHEAP EDITION OF

# THE BOOK

14 DAY USE

RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

## LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or on the date to which renewed.

Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

To be

7 Oct '56 TS !

REC'D LD

SEP 23 1956

“  
the re  
that a  
practic  
do jus  
use by  
Trade  
who a  
keep a  
have c  
are th

“  
Congr  
servic  
this c  
broad  
trade  
Manc

the  
Cong  
we ac  
them

Cong

of sc LD 21-100m-6,'56  
book (B9311s10)476

General Library  
University of California  
Berkeley

from page 478. We shall hope on some future occasion to notice this volume at greater length.”—The Liberal Magazine.

DE

House,

oints, but  
te articles  
and the  
a scarcely  
o practical  
e of Free  
iness men  
possess and  
bden Club  
e Congress

ort of the  
and most  
Traders in  
nents sown  
tion on the  
...”

ould obtain  
Free Trade  
issue, and  
o familiarise  
view.

gs of the  
me volume  
dex, it is a  
r of extracts  
September



GAYLAMOUNT  
PAMPHLET BINDER

YC 05565

*Manufactured by*  
GAYLORD BROS. Inc.  
Syracuse, N. Y.  
Stockton, Calif.

7323478

